PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From 1 INTEF	the RNATIONAL SEAR	CHING AUTHO	DRITY						
To:				PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)					
	see form F	PCT/ISA/220							
			73.405m	Date of mailing	ee form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)				
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER See paragraph 2 bel					
* *			International filing date (22.06.2004	'day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 23.07.2003				
	International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61K39/35, A61K38/01								
	Applicant BIOTECH TOOLS SA								
1.	This opinion co	ntains indicati	ons relating to the fol	lowing items:					
	⊠ Box No. I Basis of the opinion								
	☑ Box No. II Priority								
	Box No. III	•	ment of opinion with rec	ard to novelty, invent	ive step and industrial applicability				
	☐ Box No. IV	Lack of unity o	·	,	11				
	⊠ Box No. V	Reasoned stat		is.1(a)(i) with regard to as supporting such sta	o novelty, inventive step or industrial atement				
	☐ Box No. VI	Certain docum	ents cited						
	☐ Box No. VII	Certain defect	s in the international ap	plication					
☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the internati			ations on the internation	nal application					
2.									
	If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.								
	submit to the IPF	e IPEA, the applicant is invited to nents, before the expiration of three n of 22 months from the priority date,							
	For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.								
3.	For further detail	ls, see notes to	Form PCT/ISA/220.						
	no and mailing addro	an of the ICA		Authorized Officer					

Ludwig, G

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8698

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10/561 175 PAPORECUPCTIPTO 16 DEC 2005

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/006733

	Box No. I Basis of the opinion						
1.	With regard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.						
	This opinion has been established on the language , which is the language of a transcription (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	pasis of a translation from the original language into the following anslation furnished for the purposes of international search					
2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino a necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion	cid sequence disclosed in the international application and has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type of material:						
	☐ a sequence listing						
	☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing						
	b. format of material:	(
	☐ in written format						
	☐ in computer readable form						
	c. time of filling/furnishing:	•					
	☐ contained in the international application	n as filed.					
	\Box filed together with the international app	lication in computer readable form.					
	☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority	for the purposes of search.					
3.	has been filed or furnished, the required st	version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto atements that the information in the subsequent or additional as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as					
4.	4. Additional comments:	(

E	ox No. II	Priority							
1. 🛭	☐ The following document has not been furnished:								
	⊠	copy of the earlier	application	n whose pr	riority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).				
		translation of the e	arlier appl	ication who	ose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).				
					der the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has ion that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.				
2. [This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.								
3. <i>F</i>	Additional o	bservations, if nece	essary:						
	Box No. V ndustrial a				Bbis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or ns supporting such statement				
1. 8	Statement								
١	lovelty (N)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-14				
I	nventive st	tep (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-14				
ı	ndustrial a	pplicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-14 (cf. text)				

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Ć

Item V:

D1: US-B1-6312711

D2: Biochemical And Biophysical Research Communications (1996), 223(3),

492-495

D3: Journal Of Food Science (1988), 54(4), 1037-1039

 Oral desensitization is known from document D1 disclosing pharmaceutical or food compositions for treating pathologies related to graft versus host, allergic or autoimmune reactions. In D1 pepsin was used for digestion of the antigenic structures, to obtain the respective epitopes.

Document D2 discloses preparation of a haptenic peptide mixture (HPM) for the treatment of wheat allergy by digestion with **chymotrypsin**.

Document D3 investigates the efficiency of different peptidases in the production of allergy reducing epitopes from alpha-lactalbumin and \(\beta\)-lactoglobulin (= cow milk allergenic proteins in infant food where mother's milk cannot be provided). **Chymotrypsin** alone was as effective as its combination with trypsin, whereas the combination of **chymotrypsin** with pepsin was most effective.

2. Oral desensitization with chymotrypsin-produced epitopes of allergenic proteins was therefore known in the art as disclosed in documents D2 and D3.

Claims 1, and 9-11 are not regarded as inventive in view of document D2 or D3 when combined with document D1 (Art. 52(1) and 56 EPC). This objection also holds for the rest of the claims.

3. For the assessment of the present claims 8-9 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.